



AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

BY

GOLDWIN SMITH.

A

TO

SOME

JO

THE
RELATIONS BETWEEN
AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

A Reply
TO THE LATE SPEECH OF MR. SUMNER.

BY
GOLDWIN SMITH,
SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
NOW PROFESSOR IN THE CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK.

LONDON :
JOHN CAMDEN HOTTEN, 74 & 75, PICCADILLY.
1869.

[All rights reserved.]

255588

JX1428

G7

S66

Smith. C

PRELIMINARY.

No apology, it is believed, will be considered necessary for laying before English readers Mr. Goldwin Smith's recent reply to Senator Sumner's speech against the Johnson - Clarendon Treaty for the settlement of the *Alabama* and other claims.

A month ago the feeling in this country was of a very general and extraordinary character. Mr. Sumner's speech—or the substance of it—had just appeared in our newspapers, and the common impression was that, as a nation, we had placed ourselves in a difficult position—that by our unfortunate delay the time for a moderate settlement of the question had passed.

A few of our journals took high ground ; but their articles were not without a trace of casuis-

try, and what looked very like an assumption of coolness—the putting the best possible face upon a bad matter.

The extraordinary demands made by Mr. Sumner, his deliberately making out a bill of damages, and putting down in black and white figures representing hundreds of millions sterling, for the moment startled the English public, and the common question in our streets was—*Is this the general feeling in America?*

At once there arose a desire to hear from some one we knew in America—some intelligent and impartial friend who would tell us the real state of public feeling over there, and advise us for the best. That friend has spoken, and his speech is now before the reader.

PICCADILLY,

3 June, 1869.

J. S. M.

John Stuart Mill

assumption of
ble face upon

ade by Mr.
out a bill of
k and white
hundreds ster-
English public,
streets was—

?
ar from some
telligent and
the real state
ise us for the
his speech is

THE RELATIONS
BETWEEN
AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

BY
GOLDWIN SMITH.

[On the evening of May 19, Professor Goldwin Smith, to whom Senator Sumner alluded in his recent speech on the "Reverdy Johnson Treaty," delivered a reply to that speech, before the members of Cornell University (Ithaca, New York) and a crowded assembly of distinguished persons from various parts of the country.]

YOUR presence here this evening, my American friends, sanctions what perhaps on my part is rather a rash undertaking. I stand before you as an Englishman loyal to England, though not to the England of the Aristocracy, but to the England of the people.

J. S. M.

Stuart Mill-

But, at the same time, perhaps no living Englishman has more reason than I have to be grateful and attached to America. In truth, in pleading against a rupture of the friendly relations between the two countries, I am pleading not only for public interests and the interests of humanity, but for the continuance in my own case of a cherished connexion, with happy prospects of usefulness, in the service of an institution for which I anticipate as long and as noble a life in the future as that of my own English college in the past.

I am pleading, I might almost say, for my own home. It would be well if, before any country went to war, the question could be formally submitted to the reason and conscience of the whole people; and if the ministers of religion, or the moral guides of the community, whoever they may be, could be required solemnly to declare that in their judgment there is no other mode of obtaining redress for wrong. But,

iving English-
to be grateful
h, in pleading
tions between
not only for
of humanity,
wn case of a
prospects of
stitution for
noble a life in
ish college in

say, for my
, before any
could be for-
conscience of
nisters of re-
community,
ired solemnly
there is no
wrong. But,

at all events, nations ought as much as possible to lay their minds and hearts together, and understand each other as thoroughly as they can before they allow themselves to be drawn by warlike politicians and orators into shedding each other's blood.

The politicians and orators do not face the shot themselves ; they remain at home, enjoying increased popularity and louder applause, while the people, by thousands and hundreds of thousands, rot in the plague-stricken camp, or are mangled in fields of battle.

In former times, when kings and nobles led their own armies to the field, the issues of peace and war were in the hands of men of war, who at least risked their own lives, and who, being brave, were sometimes humane. Now the issues of peace and war are in the hands of men of peace, who are too often bellicose in proportion to the pacific character of their professions and their personal lack of military prowess.

PARTIES INTERESTED IN WAR.

In every nation there are men and parties inclined to war, or to a course of policy which points to war. There are soldiers looking for glory, and sailors looking not only for glory, but for prize-money. There are commercial monopolists, like the old Corn-law party in England, whose instinct tells them that the best security for monopoly is the estrangement of nations. There are courtiers who subsist upon the passions of kings, or demagogues who subsist upon the passions of the people, and to whom it is a necessity that those passions should always be kept, on some pretence or other, at fever heat. I do not accuse any living man of being so wicked as actually to wish for war; but I say that there are some against whose natural tendencies the community at large ought to be on its guard. In England there is a party, that of the Tory aristocracy, which is now depressed,

and is likely to be still more so, and to which a rupture with America would be political salvation. John Bright could not and would not remain in office to carry on a war against this country. He and his friends who are now in the Government would go out. The Tories would come into power and wield all the resources of England and the united nation in a death-struggle with American Democracy.

NATIONAL ANTIPATHIES.

It is evident that, to see this question in a fair light, we must clear our minds of national antipathy on both sides. It is painful to me, and I am almost ashamed, being personally surrounded as I am with courtesy and kindness, even to refer to the existence of such a feeling. But I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that it does exist here as well as in England. In both countries it springs, I suppose, partly from that

old quarrel, which is so dead that it ought by this time to be buried, and in which at the time the English people, who were then ruled by a demented king and a narrow oligarchy, had really no concern ; partly from a difference of institutions, which perhaps will not last long, and which, while it lasts, is merely the law of history ; mainly, as I believe, because the two nations are ignorant of each other. I read the other day in an American journal of the highest eminence, and one which I believe is an excellent exponent of popular feeling, an article giving the statistics of English pauperism, which are at present terribly high, the evil having been aggravated of late by circumstances over which we had no control, and among them, by the long stoppage of our chief industry, in consequence of the cotton famine caused by your civil war. The article concluded with these words :—

“ It is a difficult matter to deal with beggars, except in a way likely to commend itself to

English human nature — kicking them down-stairs or up the area steps—but this summary method will not decrease beggary nor prevent pauperism. Poverty is never a blessing in disguise, and pauperism is a curse to any nation. As there might be some objections, on the ground of morals, to gathering all the paupers in the kingdom into a bag and throwing them into the sea, some more feasible plan must be found. What this shall be we leave to the English themselves, and they certainly cannot complain of a lack of the raw material upon which to experiment."

I do not think I exceed the truth in saying that the writer of this feels that his readers will not be very deeply grieved by the prevalence of want and misery among the English people. If he had seen the public charities of England or knew their amount in London alone, I venture to say he would admit that kicking the poor from the door or throwing them into the sea is not the

way of disposing of them most congenial to English human nature. If he went among English statesmen and Englishmen generally he would find this sad problem of pauperism pressing on all minds and hearts, as some day, when this country is densely peopled, it may press on yours.

It is the fixed belief of a great part of the world that England is a highly aggressive power, and that you have always to be on your guard against her extending herself by force or fraud, and even to aggress yourself that you may forestall her aggression. In former times when conquest was the highest work of rulers, and the maxim was that all should take who had the power and all should keep who could,* England.

* "For why? because the good old rule
Suffices them, the simple plan
*That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.*"

WORDSWORTH'S *Rob Roy*.

both took more and kept more than her rivals, not because she was more rapacious than the France of Louis XIV., or the Spain of Philip II., or the Prussia of Frederick the Great, or the Russia of Catharine, but because her warriors and her mariners and her statesmen possessed the superior vigour which from them has passed to you. Thus it was that this continent became the heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race. But now that sounder principles have prevailed, and we have all renounced territorial aggrandizement, England is as unaggressive as her neighbours ; indeed I believe it may be affirmed with truth that she has taken the lead in a policy of moderation. She voluntarily ceded the Ionian Islands, the other great powers who had put them into her hands, being, as it was understood, not very favourable to the cession ; and I doubt whether you will find another instance of the same thing in history. She is thinking of ceding even that which is at once the great

trophy and the talisman of her empire—the rock of Gibraltar ; and this, I believe, not merely from a sense of its diminished value, but from right feeling and a sincere desire to be on friendly terms with Spain. The conquest of Abyssinia for the purpose of liberating the captives was followed by its instant evacuation. We were charged the other day by a speaker at a Cretan meeting with thwarting the emancipation of Crete by Russia because we had designs on Egypt. Both Egypt and Crete were offered to us by the late Emperor of Russia as the price of our connivance at his designs, and we not only refused the offer, but quarrelled with him for having made it. You understand I suppose what is meant by Canadian Confederation. India we cannot resign without abandoning it to anarchy, for there is no power that can rule that vast and motley group of nations but ourselves. The feeling is growing, however, that it is a burden, though a burden which we cannot now lay down.

ire—the rock
t merely from
ut from right
e on friendly
of Abyssinia
captives was
n. We were
r at a Cretan
uncipation of
d designs on
ere offered to
as the price
and we not
ed with him
nd I suppose
ration. India
it to anarchy,
that vast and
elves. The
is a burden,
ow lay down.

Soon, to all appearances, the tale of British Empire will have been told! the morning drum of England will no longer everywhere greet the rising sun; to borrow an image from Turner's famous picture which I have lately had before my eyes, the old *Temeraire* will be towed to her last moorings, her thunders silent, her fighting done. Her record is not stainless; but she has often borne your liberties up through storm and battle in her war-scarred and weather-beaten side.

THREATENED ANNEXATION OF CANADA AND THE WEST INDIES.

There are some, it seems, who wish to press demands on England with a view to annexing at once her Canadian and West Indian possessions; and this proposal, coming simultaneously with claims for reparation in the court of high morality and honour, will rather confuse the minds of our people.

I have earned, at the price of some obloquy, the right of saying that I am sincere in wishing that Great Britain and all the Powers of the Old World should take their departure as speedily as honour will permit from the New World, and leave the destinies of the New World to their own course.

England has done all the good that she can do in planting her race and her free institutions here. She has reaped all the honour that she can reap, and that honour will not die. Dismember her empire, destroy her fleets and armies, ruin her trade, do all to her of what revenge can dream, she can never be deprived of the glory of having founded you. The West Indian possessions were once offered to you, and would to heaven that you had accepted them. To us they have been a curse from the beginning. The gold which some of our people drew from them in the days of Slavery was demon gold ; it filled our politics and our society with corruption. Since the

abolition of Slavery the islands have been a mere burden to us ; they have been much worse : Jamaica has brought upon English justice a stain far worse than any loss of territory or any defeat in war. We could not allow them to pass out of our hands while there was any fear lest slavery should be restored. But now, I believe, the great majority of Englishmen would agree in saying that if we could be honourably rid of the whole group, with their population, black and white, and all their barbarisms and internecine hatreds, the loss would be a boundless gain.

With regard to Canada the attitude of England is not doubtful. She says plainly to the Canadians, your destinies are in your own hands ; if you wish to stay with me I am proud of your attachment, and no act of mine shall sever the bond ; if you prefer independence, independence is yours ; if you desire to go into the Union, go, and preserve in your new estate kind memories of old ties and of your fatherland. As

to ceding them, or any of her citizens by way of compensation for her own liabilities, it is a thought which honour would forbid her for a moment to entertain. I believe I know enough of the Canadians to say that they do not like to be threatened with annexation; that for some political and fiscal reasons, and also because, in Upper Canada at least, they are rather stiff Anglo-Saxons, they prefer to remain as they are, and that they find the rule of their parent not oppressive, because, like other American children, they rule her. Nevertheless the day will no doubt come when these vast and distant territories will cease to belong to that little island; and when geography and commercial interest will in this, as in the other cases, assert their power. But if the Canadians are prematurely forced into the Union they will carry disaffection into its vitals, combine with every other disaffected element which may now exist or which time may develop, and instead of being an addi-

tion to your strength be an aggravation of your weakness.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

Again there are some who wish to make a crusade for the rescue of Ireland. It would be too much to say that the age of crusades is past. Only let it be a crusade, not a strategical operation. Let not Ireland be again made the cover for a shot at England, and then abandoned to the rage of the wounded lion. Spain made a crusade for Ireland, and the consequence was the great Tudor conquests and confiscations. The French Republicans made a crusade for Ireland, and the consequence was the shambles of 1798. One of your most distinguished orators and philanthropists says that if England interferes with his plans of benevolence (which I hope she is not so impious as to think of doing), he will make Ireland his Gibraltar, and encamp at Dublin with 20,000 men. We had a distinguished phi-

lanthropist in England, a disciple of Bentham, who taught that in all things we ought to aim at the greatest happiness of the greatest number ; and one day we received the news that this philanthropist, who held a post in China, having had his philosophic temper ruffled by the retrograde barbarians there, was throwing bomb-shells into Canton, where, as it is the most densely peopled city in the world, the greatest possible number would participate in the happiness. But the question is, when you have encamped at Dublin with your 20,000 men, as you cannot stay there for ever, what you will leave behind. Bonaparte said to the Directory, when they had set the island on fire with a war of races, " The Irish have created a diversion for us ; what more do you want with them ? " Meantime this oratory tells ; it does not evoke any serious attempt to make Ireland independent, but it fills the island with conspiracy and assassination ; it baffles the efforts of the English Liberals under Gladstone

and Bright to unite with them the Irish Liberals in removing such evils as legislation can remove. The division of races and religions, which is the great bane of the country, has its source in remote history, and cannot be removed even by philanthropy, with all its bomb-shells and its 20,000 men. Ireland is not a dependency, like Poland ; she has a hundred members in the House of Commons, and if these members will only vote with their friends for the liberties of Ireland, instead of voting against the liberties of Italy, the Church and Land questions will soon be settled in the interest of justice.

The only grievance which will then remain will be the union itself there. Again I may say that I have earned the right to speak as one who, under Bright, and Cobden, and other good guides, has tried at least to look beyond the territorial aggrandizement of England, and to desire for her only that greatness which is compatible with justice. If I really believed that Ireland could

be happier as an independent State, I, as an Englishman, would vote for her independence. But besides the evils of the unfriendly relations that would probably subsist between the two divorced kingdoms, I must say that I have never seen proposed, nor can I myself conceive a Government to which the Protestant Saxon of the North and the Catholic Celt of the South could equally yield allegiance. It seems to me that another struggle of races and religions would almost certainly ensue; that the vanquished would call in foreign aid, and that the tragedy of Irish history would be acted over again. Humanity claims fair play for the Liberal statesmen of both England and Ireland who say, "Before we have recourse to a revolution, let us try the effect of thorough-going justice." We are now in a dangerous crisis. Mr. Sumner's speech has, I presume, rendered the renewal of negotiations for the present almost impossible; at least, they can scarcely be re-

newed on the side of England. Meantime, by that speech, and by the other demonstrations which it has called forth, a state of feeling has been engendered in which incidents which would otherwise be harmless, may lead to mischief, especially while the sparks are flying from the Cuban conflagration. We never believe that war is coming till it comes, and even now, while we are all saying that the apprehension is absurd, the Angel of Death may be setting his mark with unseen hand on the door of many an American and English home.

THE QUARREL BETWEEN ENGLAND AND THE
UNITED STATES.

Let us then at least banish rhetoric, and try to look at the grounds and sources of the quarrel, with a full sense of their gravity and of the deep sense of wrong rankling in the heart of the American people, but at the same time in a sober way.

Mr. Sumner accuses England of having taken part with Slavery. This is evidently with him the head and front of her offending; it lends a criminal hue to all her actions in his eyes; he imports it into questions of international law, where, I submit, considerations of sentiment have no place. The anti-Slavery sentiment is, in fact, almost his international law. The question of Slavery has been his one great question, and for him it fills the whole moral sphere. He can make no excuse for those who are not in perfect sympathy with him on this subject. "Not to blast," he says, "is to bless," and to bless is to lay yourself open to the most immeasured and the most conjectural imputations. Some time ago he made and published a great speech on your foreign relations, which was the precursor and almost the first draft of his recent speech in the Senate. In that speech he calls the confederation of the Slave States a "*Magnum Latrocinium*," whose fellowship can have nothing

but the filthiness of evil," "a mighty house of ill-fame," "an Ishmael," "a brood of harpies defiling all which it cannot steal," "a one-eyed Cyclop of Nations," "a soulless monster of Frankenstein," "a wretched creation of mental science without God." "Who," he proceeds, "can welcome such a creation? Who can consort with it? There is something loathsome in the idea. There is contamination even in the thought. If you live with the lame, says the ancient proverb, you will learn to limp; if you keep in the kitchen, you will smell of smoke; if you touch pitch, you will be defiled. But what lameness so pitiful as that of this pretended Power! What smoke so foul as its breath! What pitch so defiling as its touch! It is an Oriental saying, that a cistern of rose-water will become impure if a dog is dropped into it; but a continent of rose-water, with Rebel slavemongers, would be changed into a vulgar puddle. Imagine, if you please, whatever is most disgusting, and

this pretended power is more disgusting still. Naturalists report that the pike will swallow anything except the toad ; but this he cannot do. The experiment has been tried, and though this fish, in its voracity, always gulps whatever is thrown to it, yet invariably it spews this nuisance from its throat. But our slavemonger pretension is worse than the toad ; and yet there are foreign nations which, instead of spewing it forth, are already turning it, like a precious morsel, on the tongue." "Ædipus," he goes on to say, "in the saddest tale of antiquity, weds his own mother without knowing it ; but England will wed the slave power, with full knowledge that the relation, if not incestuous, is vile." And then : "The foul attorneys of the slavemonger power, reeking with slavery, will have their letters of licence as the ambassadors of slavery to rove from court to court over foreign carpets, talking, drinking, spitting slavery, and poisoning that air which has been nobly pronounced too pure for a

slave to breathe." He is not content with the refusal of England to recognise the Confederacy, he insists that she shall refuse by proclamation, so as to put the Confederates on the footing of a Cain among nations, and every moment of hesitation to issue such a proclamation he denounces as a moment of apostacy. I have said that this speech on foreign relations was the prototype of the speech on the Alabama Treaty. This is the frame of mind in which Mr. Sumner was when he formed his opinion of these international questions, and made up his mind in effect to place the two nations in their present critical position. It seems a frame of mind rather morally exalted than judicial, and not one in which a man is likely to weigh in a fair balance either the actions or the motives of those who have crossed him, or even disappointed him by their lack of ardent sympathy in the great mission of his life.

THE ENGLISH ARISTOCRACY.

It is too true that our aristocracy and plutocracy, or at least a part of them, in their fellow feeling with the aristocracy here, forget the anti-Slavery principles which are a proud part of the escutcheon of England, and for which England has not only paid much gold, but offered up many a gallant life, not on glittering fields of battle, but on the path of obscure duty beneath the deadly African sun and dew in our long crusade against the slave-trade. I fought these men hard : I believed, and believe now, that their defeat was essential to the progress of civilization. But I dare say we should have done pretty much as they did, if we had been born members of a privileged order, instead of being brought up under the blessed influence of equality and justice.

THE ENGLISH PEOPLE TRULY ANTI-SLAVERY.

The people of England on the other hand did not forget or renounce their anti-Slavery principles, though a good many of them who were strongly opposed to Slavery failed to see that Slavery was the real issue. Their mistake was pardonable. This great revolution, like most great revolutions, passed through several phases, and the first phase which settled the bias of common minds was not anti-Slavery. After the war had fairly begun Mr. Seward sent to Mr. Adams in the name of Mr. Lincoln a manifesto in the form of instructions declaring that Slavery was not attacked or threatened, and that from the nature of your Government, and the physical and social arrangements of this continent it was impossible that Slavery ever should be attacked or threatened, and he directed Mr. Adams distinctly not to claim the sympathy of Great Britain on the moral ground.

When the abolition of Slavery came as the final result of the war all England rejoiced ; no man dared to show himself a mourner for Slavery.

THE SOUTHERN PARTY IN ENGLAND.

✓ England is always assumed to have gone wrong in a lump. The more discriminating allow that there are two or three laudable but impotent exceptions. I saw two or three myself, for I was present when John Bright made his great American speech, the greatest of all his speeches, in St. James's Hall, which, I believe, holds about 4000 persons, and at a meeting in the Free Trade Hall, at Manchester, when a still larger number were present. We held mass meetings with success in all the great cities ; the other party hardly ventured to hold any. Such a struggle as this, embracing the whole world in its issues and effects, could not fail to give rise to violent divisions of sentiment in other

countries. The Southern party was strong, of course, among the wealthier classes of England ; in the high-priced journals which are published for that class, and in Parliament which, the suffrage not having at that time been extended, was aristocratic and plutocratic in its character. But the Southerners, though they made a great noise in Parliament, and thus apparently compromised the country, never succeeded in carrying a resolution in favour of the South, though they tried to do so more than once. When the Emperor of the French, at the lowest point of your fortunes, proposed to our Government interference, under the guise of mediation, the Government, in obedience to the national will, rejected the proposal. We do not claim any gratitude for this rejection or for averting the consequences which would have followed its acceptance, because we were fighting for our own cause. But we have a right to ask why Mr. Sumner, in framing his case against us, so carefully avoids

any reference to this fact. How would it look in the middle of his indictment? I appeal to your candour and your manly love of justice. It was not in England only that parties were divided. I do not want to intrude for a moment on your politics. But our people read your journals, and they could not help knowing that the strong things said by our Southern Club against the war and those who were waging it, were only the echoes of the things said by a party here. The most offensive things published in our press were the letters of Manhattan. At the time of your civil war, one-seventh of the adult male population of Great Britain had votes. Now, a much larger number have them. And now John Bright is Minister; Roebuck is turned out of his seat in Parliament, where before he was secure; and Laird escapes narrowly, and only because he is the industrial lord of Birkenhead. Your friends and allies, faithfully adhering to your cause, have

shared your victory ; they are in power, and they tender you reparation according to the international creed of their party, by a reference to arbitration, in the matter of the *Alabama*. Assuredly if it is moral revenge that you desire on the aristocratic party in England, you have it in overflowing measure. You have it in overflowing measure already, and if war does not arrest our political progress, you will soon have more.

COTTON NOT KING.

Mr. Sumner lays it to our charge that the Rebellion was originally encouraged by hopes of support from England. No doubt it was. The South thought that Cotton was our King, and that we must come to his standard. We had indeed sometimes whispered fearfully among ourselves of a dearth of Cotton as a calamity almost too terrible to put into words ; the announcement of it came to us like the knell of

doom. Rather than take part against you, the artisans of England, with their wives and families, faced starvation ; and let me say that all parties in England, Southerners as well as Northerners, came forward at once, and with free hands, to support the workmen in the distress which they endured for conscience sake.

THE RECOGNITION OF BELLIGERENCY.

The specific charges now made against us as a nation are, I believe, the premature recognition of belligerency and our failure to arrest the *Alabama*. I cannot regard as specific, till it is reduced to a distinct form and endorsed by responsible authority, the charge of having prolonged the war by our sympathy for two years. Two years from the end of the war take us back to the flood-tide of Confederate success. Is it reasonable to suppose that these men under, such leaders, fighting for such objects, and under

such penalties in case of defeat, would have laid down their victorious arms had they not been supported by the sympathy of a nation three thousand miles off which they knew to be divided in sentiment, which refused to recognise their political existence, which refused even to give an audience to their wrongs, which had flatly declined to take part in a mediation in their favour. Let me ask you frankly, would any historical inquirer accept such a theory without strong evidence from Southern archives, or from some other quarter. Again I say, I do not wish to intrude for a moment into the domestic politics of this country. But again, we could not help knowing that the prolonged existence of the Confederates was in all Republican journals and speeches ascribed to the sympathy of a party here. Assuredly, if the English did prolong the war by sympathy or by any other means, they went strangely counter to their own desires. Dying as they were for cotton, their one unani-

mous prayer was that the war might end. Some prayed that it might end in favour of the North ; others that it might end in favour of the South—but all alike prayed that it might end. As to the recognition of Confederate belligerency, I have, in the first place, again to appeal plainly to your justice. It was not England only that recognised ; France recognised at the same time, and other Powers soon after. Why then does Mr. Sumner, to whose mind this fact cannot fail to be present, keep France and the other recognising powers out of sight, and fix the charge and the liability on England alone ?

With regard to the recognition of belligerency, the sting of the charge lies, I believe, in the word premature. But which time was the right time ? I submit to your candour, that an answer to this question is an essential part of the charge against England, especially if we are called upon to pay damages in proportion to the extent of the error. I thought myself, and have always

said, that the Government had better have waited for Mr. Adams. But this would have made a difference only of a few days. And the case was really pressing ; our officers in these seas required instructions as to permitting our ships to be overhauled. Mr. Adams, at the time, objected to this step, and to a discussion in Parliament which followed it ; but he says expressly in his despatch to Mr. Seward of May 17, 1861, that he is not prepared to state that there is just ground for the idea that either the one or the other is to be taken as evidence of a disposition to chill the hopes of those whom he represented. The whole despatch is worth reading, if you want to know how rhetoric can pile Pelion upon Ossa in the course of eight years. Mr. Adams lands at Liverpool, the great cotton port and the focus of the Southern party. He finds opinion there "anxious and fluctuating," and he is told that he might do a good deal to determine it in the right direction by staying for a single day. At Lon-

don he "has reason to be fully satisfied with the reception which he meets from everybody." Any doubt as to his being received as the representative of all the States, loyal or seceding, is at once dispelled. His report on the state of public opinion is that "it is not yet exactly what he could wish, but that much depends upon the course of events in the United States, and the firmness and energy made visible in the direction of affairs."

Much, everything, depended at this critical moment on his being able to tell the English people that the North were fighting for the abolition of Slavery, but he was forbidden to tell them this; he was enjoined to assure them of the reverse. The case of your civil war was almost without a parallel in history. Generally speaking, in civil war you have two governments, or at least two party centres, but you have no clear division of territory between the two contending powers. Here, owing to the sharp line

drawn by Slavery, you had from the beginning two governments, one legitimate, the other *de facto*, each commanding the complete obedience of its own vast territory, appointing all the officers, whether military or civil, and wielding the entire force of the community for the defence of the soil.

The Union party in England, who watched with keen eyes as for the interest of their own cause, never felt that they could object to the recognition of the Confederates as belligerents. Looking to you, we saw that you treated them in all things as belligerents, and the war as a regular war ; if you had not done so the struggle, terrible as it was, would have swallowed up all the horrors in history. You will correct me if I am wrong in saying that the Supreme Court of this country has decided that the contest was a war. I mention it, not to set your own authorities against you, which is an irritating and unmannerly kind of argument, but because the judg-

ments of the Supreme Courts of the United States command the respect of the legal world.

In his speech on Foreign Relations, Mr. Sumner heads a section with "No concession of belligerency without Prize Courts, especially to Rebel Slavemongers." But this, I submit, is an instance of his habit of introducing the anti-Slavery sentiment into questions which must be governed strictly by law. If governments were to be outlawed for the badness of their domestic institutions, the world being full of political contradictions, we should be outlawing each other all round.

LAND AND OCEAN BELLIGERENCY.

However, I am not going to trench upon the province of those who are learned in international law. I must leave it to them to say whether there was any established rule or precedent which ought to have led the English Government to distinguish between belligerent rights by land

and belligerent rights on the ocean ; whether the recognition of belligerency on one element only is practicable, and whether if a land belligerent slipped out of a blockaded port he could be treated as anything but a belligerent at sea. My object is not to prove that the decision of the English Government in its choice of the time for the recognition of belligerency was right, but only to prove that it was not so palpably wrong as to warrant you in imputing to it bad motives, and in putting a criminal construction on all that followed. I deal with the moral aspect of the case alone.

THE PALMERSTON CABINET.

That the English nation and the English Government wilfully abuse their power of recognition for the purposes of a foul conspiracy against the Union, conceived in some bandit's cave of English diplomacy, and secretly supported by a perfidious people, is a notion which

may pass current while you think of an abstract England, the legendary monster of patriotic histories, the stock-in-trade demon of patriotic orations. But who were the members of the English Government? The Liberals were in power, though with a restricted suffrage. Lord Palmerston, the head of the Government, was an aristocrat by nature, and probably his personal sympathies were on the aristocratic side; but as a diplomatist he was the pupil and worshipper of Canning, the real author of the so-called Monroe doctrine; and he had embroiled us with half Europe by the almost fanatical ardour with which he crusaded against the slave trade. Lord Russell was also a hearty opponent of slavery, and had taken an active part in its abolition, beside being on the Liberal side of every question for forty years. Among the other names—Mr. Gladstone, the Duke of Argyle, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir G. C. Lewis, Lord Stanley of Alderley, the Duke of Somer-

set, Lord Chancellor Campbell, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Villiers—to which would you point as the treacherous enemy of popular government and the rights of labour? I can point to several who were their most sincere and zealous friends.

The two names in the list best known here are perhaps that of Mr. Gladstone, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the most powerful member of the Government after Lord Palmerston, and that of the Duke of Newcastle, who was Secretary of State for the Colonies, and came here with the Prince of Wales. Mr. Gladstone is now the chosen ruler of the people. For the people, to lighten the burdens of the people, to improve the lot of the people, to give the people political rights, he has taken up, held, and laid down power. Labour knows his name, and blesses it when it eats its hard-earned bread. European liberty knows his name. Ask any Italian patriot whether Mr. Gladstone could be a conspirator

against freedom. He said publicly in an unguarded moment what the most ardent friends of the Union were saying to each other in private, that Jeff Davis had succeeded in making the South a nation. And for this single inconsiderate word he has since apologized to you with all the warmth and frankness of his nature. The Duke of Newcastle retained to the end of his life the pleasantest recollections of his reception here, and the kindest feelings toward the country in which he had been so received. I was with him for the last time on the eve of my departure for America in 1863; he was then dying, and he died before my return. No man was more constant in his feelings and affections. But, above all, he was the soul of honour, and honour itself is impeached, when he is charged with having done anything in a high public trust which could bring a stain upon the good faith of his country. If explanation of the recognition is sought in a friendly spirit, a full and courteous

an un-
friends of
private,
aking the
e incon-
to you
s nature.
end of
s recep-
ward the
ived. I
ve of my
as then
No man
fections.
our, and
charged
blic trust
faith of
nition is
ourteous

explanation ought to be given conjointly by all the Powers which were parties to the act. To explain an action to a friend can never be inconsistent with true dignity, whether in the case of men or nations. But if the demand made is that England shall compel her ministers to avow that the Queen's Proclamation was not issued in good faith, the answer will be that no nation not utterly lost to honour would yield to such a demand unless reduced to the last extremity by war. You will not forget, though Mr. Sumner does not advert to it, that England steadily refused to the Confederates political recognition, and Mr. Seward's opinion is on record that the success of the Confederate envoys in Great Britain would probably have rendered their success easy elsewhere.

THE ALABAMA CASE.

With regard to the case of the *Alabama* and her consorts, if any of the other ships really came under the same category, no one has spoken in stronger terms than I have. Mr. Sumner does me the honour to cite my words as a just expression of moral feeling on the subject. I have only to say that those words were not directed against my country or its responsible Government, but against the builders and abettors of the *Alabama*. The assertion that the *Alabama* was sent out by the British nation and Government or connivance is a calumny which no Englishman would repel more warmly or confidently than I. We have in the narrative of Captain Semmes an account of all that passed between him and the Confederate Secretary of the Navy about the building of this vessel, and the plan which they formed for eluding what they call the anxiously

guarded neutrality of England—a neutrality which they on their side seem inclined to think is unduly pressed against them. As the English law plainly forbids equipment, they came to the conclusion that the *Alabama* must go out unarmed, and run the risk of capture, till she can take on board her armament in some safe port. We knew the stratagem by which she contrived to slip out to sea at the very moment when the order for her arrest was on its way. She had got notice of that order, no doubt through some bribed official, for the consequences of whose treachery the Government which employed him is liable, without being itself tainted with his guilt. Our Government sent after the *Alabama* to Nassau, whither she was supposed to be bound, and would have arrested her there. But she had gone to the Azores, where she took her armament on board, and whence she set out on her career of devastation ; and the Government were advised, too technically, as I could not help feel-

ing, that she was thenceforth out of their jurisdiction, and could be lawfully attacked by your cruisers only. It is unhappily the fact that most of her crew were Englishmen by birth : but in the seaport towns of every great maritime country there are roving spirits ready to sail for high pay under any flag, who cannot be regarded as morally committing the nation, even in the slightest degree, to any bad enterprise in which they embark ; moreover, the English seamen of this vessel were for the most part taken on board for a feigned voyage. The *Alabama* was cheered and fêted by her partisans, and not in the ports of English dependencies alone. Could she have put into Manchester or Bradford, or the artisan quarters of London, she would have been received with execration by the masses of our people.

ARBITRATION.

But I am not going now to discuss the case of the *Alabama*, with all its controverted and irritating details. For the settlement of that case your Government has proposed and ours has accepted the principle of arbitration, the only fair and reasonable mode of terminating international disputes, the only war of the civilization of the future. The arbitrators will pass judgment on Mr. Sumner's allegations, on his theory of consequential damages, and every other question involved in the great cause. We are now virtually in court, and the less said or written by irresponsible controversialists before the pleadings commence the better. If the late treaty was not so framed as fully to answer all the ends of justice, I rejoice that it was rejected. I rejoice that it was rejected if it failed to recognise any principle of international law or morality which ought to have been recognised, though it

would seem that the principle of liability was fully recognised by the submission to arbitration. Honour knows no limit to concession but that of justice. My only desire as an Englishman is, that England may pay to the uttermost farthing any debt which upon any sane theory she can have incurred, and thus stand clear before the world and in the hearts of her own people. I trust also, that if it is made to appear before an impartial tribunal that our Government has failed, however unintentionally, in the performance of any of its international duties to a friendly power, the payment of damages will be accompanied with a full acknowledgment of the error. But if Mr. Sumner means to thrust arbitration aside—if he means to insist upon being judge in his own cause, on pronouncing us guilty on any grounds which his inflamed fancy can suggest, and fining and humiliating us at his discretion—we shall appeal with confidence to the reason and moral sense of the civilized world.

Mr. Henry Adams, in the *North American Review*, says of the *Alabama* treaty, that if England could have foreseen that she would have to consent to it, she would have closed with the French proposal of intervention.

THE REJECTED TREATY.

This is at least a proof that the treaty was conceded by the English Government in good faith. Your Ambassador, duly authorized, came to us to negotiate for the settlement of the *Alabama* claim. We could not in any case have looked behind his credentials and inquired whether he had enough political support for us to treat with him ; but in this case he had been unanimously confirmed by the Senate, as we understood, with this very mission in view. He proposed terms to which the British Government acceded without abatement ; he proposed to alter his terms, and the British Government

acceded in like manner to the alterations. The treaty was in effect framed at Washington, and this fact disposes practically of any suspicion that the Ambassador was corrupted by his reception in England—a reception which I think on the part of the Tories was undignified, but on the part of the people was at once perfectly consistent and sincere. Neither when Mr. Johnson went out, nor while the negotiations were in progress on a basis which seems to have been no secret, does Mr. Sumner appear to have uttered a word of warning as to Mr. Johnson's competency to treat with us, or as to the propriety of the basis on which he was treating. When the whole process had been gone through, the treaty was kicked out of doors with contumely, amid a burst of hostility and menace against Great Britain. The senator who was the organ of that assembly on the occasion did not even acknowledge by one courteous word the humiliating position in which, by

the act of his Ambassador, the British Government had been placed. Mr. Reverdy Johnson may have given offence here by his demeanour on his mission. It does not become me to make any remarks upon that subject; but in that case surely the object of public resentment ought to have been Mr. Reverdy Johnson.

MR. SUMNER'S SPEECH AND THE ENGLISH
PEOPLE.

The impression seems to prevail that the English press, in not giving Mr. Sumner's speech in full (which it is said not to have done), has been influenced by a fear of its possible effect upon the minds of our people. If I know anything of the English people, the Government, to rouse them to fierce and unanimous resistance, has only to circulate that speech throughout the land. A whole nation is accused of entering

into a conspiracy for the subversion of a friendly power, of protecting and encouraging piracy, of itself sending out pirates, of lending an infamous aid, in contravention of its professed principles, to the most immoral of all causes, and told that it has righteously incurred immeasurable penalties, both in the way of fine and humiliation. Does Mr. Sumner think that he is declaiming against some monster of history, who is dead and can feel no more, or does he know that he is pouring insults into living hearts? I have not felt such a sense of wrong since I read the libels on America in some English newspapers at the time of the civil war; but those libels were the work of anonymous and irresponsible writers, whose calumnies cannot touch the honour of man or nation. This is the speech of the organ of the Senate, delivered with the concurrence of all his colleagues. Insults are not rendered less bitter when they are followed by professions of a desire for concord, which coming in the train of insults,

becomes an insult in itself ; nor is the sting taken out of the throat of war by putting it into the mouths of other persons, while the orator himself takes the fine part of the Archangel of Peace. I am persuaded that the treaty might have been rejected without causing any irritation in England ; and negotiations might have been renewed in a perfectly amicable spirit, and with a cordial desire to give you satisfaction on the part of the British nation, if the organ of your Senate had been a speaker less unconscious of the existence of self-respect and sensitiveness to honour in other men. I told you, my friends, at the commencement of my address, that it was a rash undertaking which you sanctioned by your presence here ; and of all the things which I have said this is the only thing which will have commanded your respect. I hope never to speak again on any controverted question bordering upon politics. My short public life, if it can be dignified with that name, has been bounded by

the American struggle and the struggle for the extension of the suffrage in England, which was closely connected with the American struggle, and has been greatly influenced by its result. My first speech in public was made against the *Alabama*; this, I trust, will be my last. I repeat that there is no living Englishman who has more reason to be grateful and attached to America than I have, but a man's attachment to an adopted country is worthless if he has no regard for the honour of his own.

THE END.

Savill, Edwards & Co., Printers, Chandos-street, Covent-garden.

33-

for the
which was
struggle,
as result.
against the
I repeat
has more
America
t to an
o regard

garden.

33-